

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,434	09/22/2000	Marc Etienne Bonneville	AP628US 9404	
75	90 03/23/2005		EXAM	INER
Thomas Adams & Associates			MICHALSKI, JUSTIN I	
PO Box 11100				
Station H			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Ottawa, ON K2H7T8			2644	
CANADA				

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summer:	09/667,434	BONNEVILLE, MARC ETIENNE				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Justin Michalski	2644				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2004.						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.	•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-67 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		* *				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		` '				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) lnterview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/667,434 Page 2

Art Unit: 2644

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

- 1. Claims 40-55 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 40-55 have not been further treated on the merits.
- 2. Due to the objections of claims 40-55 the means and bounds of the instant application cannot be determined along with placement of claims 40-55 with respect to the election/restriction below.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 29 September 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that claims 40-55 are not multiple dependent claims since the phrases "for use in apparatus according to claim #,... merely identifies the apparatus with which the claimed audio distribution unit is to interface". This is not persuasive as MPEP § 608.01(n) clearly states that, "Any dependent claim which refers to more than one other claim ('multiple dependent claim') shall refer to such other claims in the alternative only." The fact that claims 40-55 depend on more than one other claim make them multiple dependent claims and are further improper by not referring to other claims in the alternative.

Election/Restrictions

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C.121:

- I. Claims 1-24, 30-37, 62-64, and 66 drawn to one-way audio signal program distribution, classified in class 381, subclass 77.
- II. Claims 25-29, 56-61, and 67 drawn to voice distribution, classified in class 704, subclass 200.
- III. Claims 38, 39, 59-61, and 65 are drawn to multiple channel audio distribution, classified in class 381, subclass 80.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and III are related as combination and subcombination.

Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because audio distribution could take place without the use of trounds 1 and 2. The subcombination has separate utility such as providing output signals from audio input means.

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP §

Application/Control Number: 09/667,434

Art Unit: 2644

806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different invention I relates to one way audio signal distribution while invention II relates to voice transmission and distribution.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Invention I contains species group I containing claims 1-24, 30-32, species group II containing claims 33-37, 62-64 and 66.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.

An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by

Application/Control Number: 09/667,434

Art Unit: 2644

37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin Michalski whose telephone number is (703)305-5598. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on (703)305-4040. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/667,434

Art Unit: 2644

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SINH TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

JIM